

EXHIBIT A

[Submitting Counsel on Signature Page]

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

IN RE: SOCIAL MEDIA ADOLESCENT
ADDICTION/PERSONAL INJURY
PRODUCTS LIABILITY LITIGATION

MDL No. 3047

Case No. 4:22-03047-YGR

This Document Relates to:

**JOINT REPORT ON PROPOSED
DISCOVERY PLANS**

ALL ACTIONS

Judge: Hon. Yvonne Gonzalez Rogers

Magistrate Judge: Hon. Peter H. Kang

Pursuant to the Court's Discovery Management Order No. 1, at 2 (ECF No. 503), the Parties have met and conferred and respectfully submit their positions on various aspects of a proposed discovery plan consistent with Fed. R. Civ. P. 16 and 26(f)(2)-(3):

I. Case Management Orders to Advance and Efficiently Manage this MDL

A. Order Governing Sealing Procedures

The Court entered an Order Governing Sealing Procedures on August 1, 2023. *See* ECF No. 341.

B. Rule 502(d) Clawback Order

The Court entered a Rule 502(d) Clawback Order on April 25, 2023. *See* ECF No. 248.

C. Protective Order

The Court entered a Protective Order on May 22, 2023. *See* ECF No. 290. On December 14, 2023, this Court heard argument on Plaintiffs' objection to Paragraph 7.6 regarding the early

1 disclosure of experts who receive Protected Material designated as “Highly Confidential.” As
2 directed by the Court (*see* ECF No. 503), on December 18, 2023, the Parties re-filed their
3 protective order briefing as a motion to amend the protective order. *See* ECF No. 501 (Motion to
4 Modify Protective Order and related briefing); 502 (State Attorneys’ Generals Position
5 Statement); 506 (Meta’s response to State Attorneys General).

6 **D. Order Governing Preservation of CSAM**

7 The Court entered an Order Governing Preservation of CSAM on December 12, 2023.
8 *See* ECF No. 475.

9 **E. ESI Protocol**

10 The Parties are negotiating a proposed ESI Protocol to govern the identification and
11 production of ESI and hard copy documents. The status of the Parties’ disputes is addressed in
12 the Parties’ separately-filed Joint Chart of ESI Order Disputes Pursuant to Discovery
13 Management Order No. ECF Nos. 534, 534-1.

14 **F. Privilege Log Protocol**

15 The Parties are negotiating a proposed protocol to govern the Parties’ privilege logs and
16 procedures for bringing challenges. By February 12, 2024, the Parties will submit a proposed
17 Privilege Log Protocol or competing protocols together with a joint letter not to exceed five (5)
18 pages, evenly divided between the Parties, and formatted with text at 12-point font or greater,
19 single-spaced with reasonable margins, and line breaks between paragraphs.

20 **G. Deposition Protocol**

21 The Parties are negotiating a deposition protocol to govern the scheduling and taking of
22 depositions. By February 20, 2024, the Parties will submit a proposed deposition protocol or
23 competing protocols together with a joint letter not to exceed five (5) pages, evenly divided
24 between the Parties, and formatted with text at 12-point font or greater, single-spaced with
25 reasonable margins, and line breaks between paragraphs.

26 **H. Source Code Order**

27 The Parties are meeting and conferring regarding the need for a source code order
28 governing the production of and/or access to source code and will raise with the Court at the

1 appropriate time.

2 **I. Bellwether Order**

3 **Plaintiffs' Position:**

4 The Parties are negotiating a bellwether order to establish a bellwether trial selection
5 procedure, including which specific Plaintiffs are subject to individual discovery beyond the
6 Plaintiff Fact Sheet, to run concurrently with fact discovery. By March 1, 2024, the Parties will
7 submit a proposed bellwether order or competing orders together with a joint letter not to exceed
8 five (5) pages, evenly divided between the Parties, and formatted with text at 12-point font or
9 greater, single-spaced with reasonable margins, and line breaks between paragraphs.

10 **Defendants' Position:**

11 At Judge Kuhl's direction, the Parties have begun meeting and conferring on discovery
12 pool and bellwether selection for the JCCP Personal Injury plaintiffs. Defendants will meet and
13 confer with the MDL Plaintiffs regarding the submission of a bellwether order for the MDL
14 Personal Injury Plaintiffs, but believe it is premature to set a deadline at this time, before a
15 Plaintiff Fact Sheet ("PFS") Implementation Order has even been entered in the MDL, let alone
16 any PFS data received—a necessary prerequisite to bellwether selection. Defendants also believe
17 this issue should be presented to Judge Gonzalez Rogers in the first instance, who will set the trial
18 schedules in these cases.

19 **J. User Account Identification Order, Plaintiff Fact Sheet, and Defendant Fact**
20 **Sheet (Personal Injury Actions)**

21 On December 14, 2023, the JCCP Court entered the User Account Identification Order
22 and the Plaintiff Fact Sheet Order for the Personal Injury actions. The Personal Injury Plaintiffs
23 and Defendants plan to submit these orders (conformed as appropriate for the MDL) to the Court
24 soon.

25 Defendants and the JCCP Plaintiffs are negotiating a Defendant Fact Sheet ("DFS") and
26 an implementation order in the JCCP with respect to the Personal Injury actions. Within 10 days
27 following entry in the JCCP, the Personal Injury Plaintiffs and Defendants will submit the DFS
28 and implementation order (conformed as appropriate for the MDL) for this Court's consideration.

The Personal Injury Plaintiffs and Defendants will use MDL Centrality as the online platform for data management of fact sheets and related documents.

K. Plaintiff Fact Sheet and Defendant Fact Sheet (School District and Local Government Entity Actions)

Defendants and the JCCP Plaintiffs anticipate negotiating a PFS and DFS to be completed by each School District and Local Government Entity Plaintiff and Defendant. Within 10 days following entry in the JCCP, the School District and Local Government Entity Plaintiffs and Defendants will submit these proposed orders (conformed as appropriate for the MDL) for this Court's consideration.

II. Discovery Plan¹

A. Rule 26 Initial Disclosures

All-Plaintiffs' Position:

Defendants shall provide Rule 26(a) initial disclosures to the Personal Injury and School District and Local Government Entity ("PI/SD") Plaintiffs on or before January 26, 2024. The Plaintiff Fact Sheet Implementation Order shall govern the PI/SD Plaintiffs' discovery obligations at this time, including Rule 26(a) initial disclosures. Defendant(s) named by the State Attorneys General and the State Attorneys General waive their right to Rule 26 Initial Disclosures vis-à-vis one another.

PI/SD Plaintiffs' Further Position:

The purpose of initial disclosures under Rule 26(a)(1) is to "allow the parties to adequately prepare their cases for trial and to avoid unfair surprise." *Lindsay v. First La Brea, LLC*, No. CV203360JFWPVCX, 2020 WL 12188179, at *1 (C.D. Cal. Oct. 6, 2020) (quoting *Russell v. Absolute Collection Services, Inc.*, 763 F.3d 385, 396 (4th Cir. 2014)). The PI/SD Plaintiffs will be providing the information numerated in Rule 26(a)(1) through the Plaintiff Fact Sheet. Defendants, however, will not be required to identify witnesses or documents relevant to

¹ This Discovery Plan is intended to apply only to discovery of common issues. It is understood that additional, non-duplicative fact and expert discovery may be conducted in connection with a discovery pool and ultimately bellwether cases. The Parties will discuss what, if any, supplemental fact and expert discovery is required in the context of any Bellwether Orders and will seek the Court's assistance if they are unable to reach agreement.

1 common issues as part of the Defendant Fact Sheet, which is limited to case-specific information
2 and does not require witness names. Although the Parties attempted to negotiate a preservation
3 order for over a year, at no point during those discussions were key witnesses identified. The
4 PI/SD Plaintiffs require this information in order to efficiently and effectively tailor subsequent
5 discovery and determine which witnesses need to be deposed. Defendants have had more than a
6 year to prepare for initial disclosures as a routine part of litigation, and any burden of doing so
7 now does not outweigh the importance to the ability of PI/SD Plaintiffs to proceed with targeted
8 and efficient discovery.

9 A disclosure of trial witnesses, while important at the appropriate juncture, will not serve
10 this key purpose of initial disclosures. *See Holak v. K Mart Corp.*, No. 1:12-cv-00304-AWI-MJS,
11 2014 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 139879, at *12-13 (E.D. Cal. Sep. 30, 2014) (explain that late disclosure
12 of witnesses throws a wrench in the “smooth progression of the litigation”). Defendants’ proposal
13 to identify trial witnesses *2 weeks after* the close of fact discovery is plainly not an adequate
14 substitute. Defendants themselves acknowledge the need to depose any trial witnesses who are
15 disclosed, so relying solely on such a post-discovery disclosure runs the risk of reopening
16 discovery and thereby undermining the remaining schedule and the trial date.

17 In short, Defendants’ objection to providing initial disclosures will only result in delay
18 and a “go fish” exercise by Plaintiffs to guess which witnesses or documents Defendants intend to
19 use to support their defenses. *See also* Fed. R. Civ. P. 37(c) (disallowing a party to use
20 information or witnesses that it failed to provide as required by Rule 26(a) or (e) in motion
21 practice, at a hearing, or at trial).

22 **Defendants’ Position:**

23 Defendants have already made or will soon be making extensive initial disclosures to the
24 PI/SD Plaintiffs in connection with their prior negotiations regarding a potential Preservation
25 Order, certain Defendants’ re-production of documents previously produced to State Attorneys
26 General, and Defendant Fact Sheets. Indeed, certain Defendants have already produced to
27 Plaintiffs over 65,000 documents relevant to common issues in this case, which reflect the
28 identities of potential witnesses.

Accordingly, initial disclosures should be waived for all Parties in all three sets of cases—not only for Plaintiffs in the PI/SD cases, as Plaintiffs propose. However, the Parties should be required to make final disclosures of fact witnesses for trial no later than two weeks after the close of fact discovery (or March 5, 2026, assuming entry of Defendants’ Discovery Plan on February 15, 2024). All Parties agree that any witness disclosed for trial after the close of fact discovery must have the opportunity to be deposed by opposing Parties (if they have not already been deposed) prior to expert rebuttal deadlines.

B. Completion of Written Defensive Discovery

Plaintiffs’ Position:

Plaintiffs propose that by June 28, 2024, Defendants shall complete production of documents responsive to discovery served before January 25, 2024, which production shall be carried out on a “rolling” basis. Disputes as to certain requested information shall not be a reason to delay production of information that is not in dispute.

An interim deadline to complete production of documents responsive to PI/SD Plaintiffs’ initial requests disincentivizes the “gotcha” gamesmanship of producing key documents near the close the fact of discovery. These practices prevent the requesting party from timely requesting additional key documents or adequately deposing witnesses in preparing for trial.

Plaintiffs’ proposed deadline of June 28, 2024 provides Defendants with five months to make their productions, a reasonable amount of time considering the substance and nature of the requests. Six identical sets of requests address issues that are common to all Defendants, and focus on standard categories of documents appropriate for early discovery such as corporate organization and finance, as well as on features and safety measures core to the allegations in this case. The remaining, Defendant-specific RFPs are generally “go fetch” requests seeking specifically identified documents or following up on documents already produced or facts learned from publicly available information.

Given this relatively circumscribed scope and the aim of the requests to kick-start efficient discovery, Plaintiffs submit that the proposed deadline for substantial completion of responsive productions is eminently reasonable. Such interim deadlines serve to keep discovery on track

1 toward its ultimate completion. In contrast, Defendants’ suggestion that the Parties must resolve
2 all objections to every one of Plaintiffs’ RFPs in order to negotiate custodians and search
3 methodologies departs from standard practice and has no justification, particularly given the
4 extensive knowledge Defendants already have from Plaintiffs’ allegations. It is a recipe for
5 delaying document production and incentivizing extended disputes. Of course, in keeping with
6 general practice to date and professional courtesy, Plaintiffs will consider reasonable requests for
7 extensions of time regarding these productions.

8 **Defendants’ Position:**

9 As of the filing of this statement, the PI/SD Plaintiffs have already served a total of 609
10 requests for production on all Defendants, including 175 requests on Meta, 197 requests on
11 TikTok, 116 requests on Google and YouTube, and 121 requests on Snap. Of those, 108 requests
12 are identical and were served on all Defendants, with responses and objections currently due on
13 February 26, 2024. The PI/SD Plaintiffs have categorized those common requests into the
14 following issues: organization and finance, features and warnings, health and safety, user
15 demographics and targeting, marketing and lobbying, and student safety. Contrary to Plaintiffs’
16 suggestion, these requests are anything but “relatively circumscribed [in] scope”; in combination,
17 they demand “all documents” covering nearly every aspect of Defendants’ businesses over
18 decades. The remaining Defendant-specific requests are also expansive, and while some demand
19 specific documents, many others request “all documents” and “all communications” related to
20 various issues potentially relevant to this litigation.

21 Plaintiffs’ suggestion that Defendants should be expected to complete their production of
22 documents responsive to all discovery currently pending by June 28, 2024 is therefore
23 unreasonable. Before the Parties can even negotiate the full set of custodians and search terms to
24 be applied to these 609 requests, the Parties will first need sufficient time to resolve Defendants’
25 objections to the requests, most of which are not due to be served on the PI/SD Plaintiffs’ until
26 February 26.² After that, Defendants will then need a considerable amount of time to search for,

27 _____
28 ² Plaintiffs’ response on this point is a strawman. Defendants are not suggesting that *all*
objections must be resolved before some search terms and custodians can be negotiated, and

collect, and review a significant volume of documents before the full set of responsive documents can be identified. Because the PI/SD Plaintiffs' current requests implicate nearly every aspect of Defendants' business, Defendants anticipate it will require a massive amount of machine processing and human time to complete the document collection and review. Defendants will also need additional time to redact for, e.g., privilege, personally identifying information, and the Stored Communications Act.

For these reasons and others, it would be unreasonable and impractical to require Defendants to complete a fulsome production under the unnecessarily truncated timeline Plaintiffs have proposed. Defendants instead propose that all document productions, including productions responsive to requests served before January 25, 2024, be completed on a rolling basis by February 19, 2026 (the close of fact discovery in Defendants' proposed schedule).

C. Discovery Cut-Offs:

The Parties propose the following cut-offs for the close of fact and expert discovery:

Description	Plaintiffs' Proposed Deadline	Defendants' Proposed Deadline (Dates Assume Entry of Plan on February 15, 2024)
Close of Fact Discovery	November 15, 2024 (provided no phasing)	February 19, 2026
Close of Expert Discovery	March 1, 2025 (provided no phasing)	July 9, 2026 (20 weeks later)

Plaintiffs' Position:

Plaintiffs' proposal includes a workable schedule that adheres to Rule 1's mandate to "secure the just, speedy, and inexpensive determination of every action and proceeding." Fed. R. Civ. P. 1. In particular, Plaintiffs' schedule should phasing not be ordered provides for fact discovery to be complete in approximately 10 months and expert discovery completed approximately 4 months later, which would permit the first bellwether trial to take place in 2025

Defendants will be prepared to begin negotiating search terms for some of those requests after responses are served on February 26. At that time, however, Defendants expect to have objections to many of the other requests, and objections as to those requests must be resolved before the Parties will be able to agree to the full set of terms and custodians.

1 or early 2026 depending on the Court's schedule.³ Defendants' schedule, on the other hand,
 2 allocates approximately 2 *years* to fact discovery and another 5 months to expert discovery.
 3 Under Defendants' schedule, trial would not take place until the *end of 2026 or 2027*.⁴ Such an
 4 extremely lengthy schedule is unwarranted. Discovery is underway: Defendants Meta, TikTok,
 5 and Snap already made initial productions of documents, which were part of the months long
 6 inquiry by the Attorneys General into the exact conduct by Defendants at issue in this case; many
 7 additional documents and information are publicly available through congressional testimony by
 8 whistleblowers with respect to Meta; the Parties have spent over a year developing the foundation
 9 (e.g., 502(d) Order, ESI Protocol, Protective Order) required for discovery;⁵ and the PI/SD
 10 Plaintiffs have already propounded initial sets of requests for production of documents and
 11 anticipate serving notices of deposition pursuant to Rule 30(b)(6) shortly.

12 **Defendants' Position:**

13 Defendants propose a general fact discovery cutoff of February 19, 2026 (105 weeks after
 14 entry of a Discovery Plan if entered on February 15, 2024). In light of the extensive document
 15 discovery already served on Defendants (as explained above), and the unknown volume of
 16 additional written discovery that Plaintiffs may still serve, it would be unreasonable for all fact
 17 discovery on four Defendants in these sprawling cases to be completed within the timeframe
 18 suggested by Plaintiffs. Furthermore, concluding Defendant fact discovery this year would be
 19 asymmetrical with later-commenced bellwether discovery.

20 Defendants propose a non-general causation expert discovery cut-off that is 20 weeks
 21 after Defendants' proposed fact-discovery cutoff. Under Plaintiffs' proposed deadline, expert
 22 discovery would be completed 15 weeks after the close of fact discovery. Defendants believe that
 23 5 additional weeks are needed to ensure all Parties have sufficient time to serve their reports and

24 _____
 25 ³ It bears mentioning that Plaintiffs' schedule in the event that the Court does not order phasing of
 general causation is 2 *months shorter* than Defendants' proposed schedule for general causation
 discovery only.

26 ⁴ As this Court is aware, discovery in this matter is linked to the pending JCCP. Under California
 Code of Civil Procedure § 583.310 an action must be brought to trial in 5 years after it is
 27 commenced against the defendants, making the JCCP's trial deadline December 2027. Any delay
 in Defendants' proposed schedule would jeopardize the 5 year trial date mandate.

28 ⁵ The Parties have agreed to interim deadlines within the next few months to complete any
 additional orders needed for discovery to proceed smoothly.

1 depose all experts that may be identified in this case.

2 Contrary to Plaintiffs' suggestion, Defendants are not proposing any "phasing" of
3 discovery in connection with their general causation staging proposal (or otherwise). Defendants
4 have been clear that they are not seeking to stay or limit discovery as Plaintiffs contend. Instead,
5 Defendants seek an earlier and separate resolution of Rule 702 challenges to Plaintiffs' general
6 causation experts, with sufficient time for Plaintiffs to take whatever fact discovery they feel may
7 bear on that issue.⁶

8 **D. Supplemental Expert Discovery Plan.**

9 By March 7, 2024, the Parties shall submit a supplemental expert discovery plan and
10 proposed case management order for expert reports and depositions.

11 * * *

12 For the convenience of the Court, the Parties include below a chart showing the proposed
13 dates identified above to the extent Judge Gonzalez Rogers does not order the prioritization of
14 general causation. The Parties' alternative proposed schedules, should Judge Gonzalez Rogers
15 order the prioritization of general causation, are stated in Section III below.

Description	Plaintiffs' Proposed Deadline	Defendants' Proposed Deadline (Dates Assume Entry of Plan on February 15, 2024)
Defendants' Rule 26 Initial Disclosures	January 26, 2024	Initial disclosures should be waived for all Parties, with a deadline of March 5, 2026 (two weeks after the close of fact discovery) for the Parties to make their final disclosure of fact witnesses for trial
Privilege Log Protocol	February 12, 2024	February 12, 2024
Deposition Protocol	February 20, 2024	February 20, 2024

26 ⁶ Defendants' proposed schedule would not "jeopardize the 5 year trial date mandate" in
27 California state court, as Plaintiffs assert. The five-year limitations period for bringing actions to
28 trial in California state court does not include the time during which there is a complete stay of all
proceedings, Cal. Code. Civ. P. § 583.340(b), *Bruns v. E-Com. Exch., Inc.*, 51 Cal. 4th 717, 730
(2011), which the Court issued last February, *see* Feb. 10, 2023 Minute Order; Feb. 17 Minute
Order.

Description	Plaintiffs' Proposed Deadline	Defendants' Proposed Deadline (Dates Assume Entry of Plan on February 15, 2024)
Personal Injury Bellwether Order	March 1, 2024	Defendants will meet and confer with Plaintiffs regarding the submission of a bellwether order to Judge Gonzalez Rogers, but believe that it is premature to set a deadline for the submission of that order at this time
Supplemental Expert Discovery Plan	March 7, 2024	March 7, 2024
Completion of Production of Documents responsive to Requests served by January 25, 2024	June 28, 2024	February 19, 2026 (fact discovery cut-off)
Close of Fact Discovery	November 15, 2024	February 19, 2026
Close of Expert Discovery	March 1, 2025	July 9, 2026

The deadlines and other provisions set forth in the Court's prior scheduling orders remain in effect. *See* ECF No. 503 (Discovery Management Order No. 1).

III. Alternative Discovery Schedules Should Judge Gonzalez Rogers Grant Defendants' Request Relating to General Causation

On December 13, 2023, the Court granted Defendants leave to file letter briefs on strategies to facilitate early resolution of the issue of general causation relative to the Personal Injury Plaintiffs' Master Complaint. *See* ECF No. 479 (Case Management Order No. 7) at 3. Pursuant to Case Management Order No. 7 (ECF No. 479), on January 15, 2024, the Personal Injury Plaintiffs and Defendants filed opening letter briefs on their respective positions (*see* ECF Nos. 536 and 537), and on January 19, 2024, they filed their rebuttal letter briefs.

Plaintiffs' Position:

Defendants' request to prioritize or phase general causation should be denied for the reasons articulated in Plaintiffs' letter brief to Judge Gonzalez Rogers filed on January 15, 2024

(ECF No. 537) and rebuttal letter brief to be filed on January 19, 2024.

Should Judge Gonzalez Rogers order prioritization of general causation, Plaintiffs propose the following schedule:⁷

Description	Deadline
Parties to serve expert reports related to general causation	December 2, 2024
Parties to serve rebuttal experts reports related to general causation	January 17, 2025
Close of Expert Discovery on general causation	March 3, 2025
Close of Fact Discovery	June 6, 2025
Parties to serve remaining expert reports (including case specific)	July 18, 2025
Parties to serve rebuttal experts reports on remaining issues (including case specific)	August 15, 2025
Close of Expert Discovery	September 12, 2025

Should the Court phase general causation discovery, Plaintiffs' alternative schedule includes approximately 3 months after the general causation deadline for additional fact discovery, and thereafter approximately 3 months for non-causation liability expert discovery and case specific expert discovery. This alternative schedule provides additional time compared to Plaintiffs' proposed schedule in Section II above, due to the inefficiencies introduced by phasing (*see* Pls' position on phasing at ECF No. 537), which would entail the Parties conducting fact

⁷ Plaintiffs' objected to Defendants including the joint chart below because it does not accurately reflect Plaintiffs' position. Defendants refused to remove it from this submission.

discovery while simultaneously conducting expert discovery, briefing and hearings regarding general causation. But it would still be ten months shorter than Defendants' overall schedule.

Given the coordination between this action and the JCCP, Plaintiffs also propose simultaneous expert reports, as is common practice in California state court. *See* Cal. Civ. Proc. Code § 2034.210. Should the Court not agree to simultaneous expert reports, Plaintiffs propose they produce their general causation expert reports on December 2, 2024, and Defendants produce their general causation expert reports on January 13, 2025. Plaintiffs also object to Defendants deposing Plaintiffs' experts prior Defendants serving their expert reports. This is not common practice and would unfairly disadvantage Plaintiffs' experts.

Defendants' Position:

Defendants have asked Judge Gonzalez Rogers to enter an order in the Personal Injury cases that prioritizes the deadlines for the Parties' disclosure of experts on general causation, and the filing and adjudication of Rule 702 motions concerning the admissibility of Plaintiffs' general causation experts' testimony. Defendants' request should be granted for the reasons articulated in Defendants' letter brief to Judge Gonzalez Rogers filed on January 15, 2024 (ECF No. 536) and rebuttal letter brief to be filed on January 19, 2024.

To the extent Judge Gonzales Rogers prioritizes the deadlines for the Parties' disclosure of experts on general causation as Defendants have proposed, Defendants propose the following deadlines related to general causation experts, which can be slated into Defendants' overall proposed Discovery Plan without modification:

Description	Deadline (Dates Assume Entry of Plan on February 15, 2024)
Plaintiffs serve expert reports related to general causation	January 9, 2025
Deadline to depose Plaintiffs' general causation experts	February 20, 2025
Defendants serve expert reports related to general causation	March 20, 2025
Deadline to depose Defendants' general causation	May 1, 2025

Description	Deadline (Dates Assume Entry of Plan on February 15, 2024)
experts	
General causation expert discovery closed ⁸	May 1, 2025
Plaintiffs serve remaining expert reports	March 19, 2026
Defendants serve remaining expert reports	April 30, 2026
Deadline to depose Defendants' remaining experts	May 28, 2026
Expert discovery closed	July 9, 2026

Because Defendants are not seeking a stay of discovery, their proposal prioritizing resolution of challenges to Plaintiffs' general causation experts does not prejudice Plaintiffs' ability to proceed in litigating and taking discovery of Defendants. It similarly permits taking discovery of Plaintiffs.

Defendants' staging proposal does not introduce "inefficiencies," as Plaintiffs assert. To the contrary, deciding earlier the case-wide issue of whether Plaintiffs can introduce reliable expert testimony to meet their burden of proof on general causation will promote the efficient resolution or narrowing of this MDL, as explained in Defendants' letter-briefing. Plaintiffs fail to explain how "conducting fact discovery while simultaneously conducting expert discovery, briefing and hearings regarding general causation" would introduce inefficiencies, when all of that discovery and briefing and hearings will occur regardless of whether general causation is staged for earlier resolution; Defendants' proposal, if accepted, would merely advance the deadlines for expert reports and Rule 702 motions on this one issue, which otherwise would simply be resolved at a later point in time.

Plaintiffs' proposal to serve expert reports simultaneously would also be highly inefficient. Plaintiffs bear the burden of proving general causation, and Defendants' expert reports will necessarily be responsive to the reports served by Plaintiffs' experts.

⁸ If Judge Gonzalez Rogers permits early Rule 702 challenges to Plaintiffs' general causation experts, the Parties would submit Rule 702 motions within a reasonable time after the close of general causation expert discovery.

Defendants do not believe that Party discovery is necessary for Plaintiffs to prepare their general causation expert reports, but Defendants' proposed timing would allow Plaintiffs to conduct any such targeted discovery they believe they need for such experts. In making this proposal, Defendants do not represent or commit to being able to complete additional discovery before the proposed deadline for Plaintiffs to disclose general causation expert reports.

For the convenience of the Court, Defendants include below a chart showing the proposed dates identified above to the extent general causation staging is ordered.⁹

Description	Defendants' Proposed Deadline (Dates Assume Entry of Plan on February 15, 2024)	Plaintiffs' Proposed Deadline
Plaintiffs serve expert reports related to general causation	January 9, 2025	December 2, 2024
Deadline to depose Plaintiffs' general causation experts	February 20, 2025	N/A
Defendants serve expert reports related to general causation	March 20, 2025	December 2, 2024 (if simultaneous) January 13, 2025 (if not simultaneous)
Deadline to depose Defendants' general causation experts	May 1, 2025	N/A
Deadline to serve rebuttal expert reports related to general causation	N/A	January 17, 2025 (if simultaneous)
General causation expert discovery closed	May 1, 2025	March 3, 2025
Close of fact discovery	February 19, 2026	June 6, 2025
Plaintiffs serve remaining expert reports	March 19, 2026	July 18, 2025

⁹ Plaintiffs objected to including this chart jointly, so Defendants included it in their section. Plaintiffs did not identify any inaccuracies in the chart.

Defendants serve remaining expert reports	April 30, 2026	July 18, 2025 (simultaneous)
Deadline to depose Defendants' remaining experts	May 28, 2026	N/A
Deadline to serve rebuttal expert reports	N/A	August 15, 2025 (if simultaneous)
Expert discovery closed	July 9, 2026	September 12, 2025

IV. **Limitation or Modifications to Discovery.**

A. **Interrogatories**

Plaintiffs' Position:

Unless otherwise agreed by the parties, the PI/SD Plaintiffs may serve no more than fifty (50) interrogatories on each Defendant, and the States Attorneys General may serve no more than twenty-five (25) interrogatories on each Defendant named by the State Attorneys General, including discrete subparts. Leave to serve additional interrogatories may be granted to the extent consistent with Rule 26(b)(1) and (2). The Bellwether Order shall govern the limitations as to the number and scope of interrogatories Defendants may collectively serve on bellwether plaintiffs. Defendant(s) named by the State Attorneys General may serve no more than twenty-five (25) interrogatories, including discrete subparts, on the State Attorneys General as a whole.

Plaintiffs submit that these limits are reasonable in a case of this complexity where there are multiple groups of Plaintiffs with overlapping but distinct allegations and different claims, and with different representation. The Parties agree that the Bellwether Order shall govern the limitations as to the number and scope of interrogatories Defendants may collectively serve on bellwether plaintiffs beyond the Plaintiff Fact Sheet.

Defendants' Position:

To enhance the efficiencies these proceedings were created to address, including in coordination with the JCCP, all three sets of Plaintiffs in this MDL—the (1) Personal Injury Plaintiffs, (2) Local Government Entity Plaintiffs, and (3) State AG Plaintiffs—as well as the

JCCP plaintiffs should be required to coordinate defensive discovery. That is particularly so where their various complaints substantially overlap in terms of the factual allegations and issues presented (even if their formal causes of action may differ).

Defendants propose that Plaintiffs as a group (including the JCCP plaintiffs) be limited to no more than forty (40) interrogatories on each Defendant. Any Defendants named in State AG cases would be limited to serving the same number of interrogatories (no more than forty (40)) on each State AG Plaintiff.¹⁰

Defendants agree that Bellwether Orders, to the extent entered, shall govern the limitations as to the number and scope of interrogatories Defendants may collectively serve on the PI/SD Plaintiffs related to a discovery pool and ultimately bellwether cases.

For the avoidance of doubt, limitations on discovery for each “Defendant” as used in Defendants’ position statements herein shall be defined such that related corporate entities and any employees of those corporate entities who are named individually in any MDL member case are a single Defendant. “State Attorney General Plaintiff” includes state employees and state agencies outside of the State Attorney General’s office.

The Parties will further meet and confer about the scope and any limitations on third-party discovery.

Snap and YouTube’s Position:

YouTube and Snap agree that setting reasonable limits on written discovery is appropriate in this proceeding, and agree that Plaintiffs should coordinate discovery among themselves to streamline and avoid duplication. But the parties have not yet had sufficient opportunity to fully assess and confer as to what specific limits are reasonable and appropriate in this case, including the applicability of Rule 26’s proportionality principle. Moreover, YouTube and Snap’s view is that this Plan should be focused on the overall structure and schedule for various discovery components in this matter. For these reasons, YouTube and Snap respectfully request that the parties be directed to further meet and confer as to particular limitations on written discovery

¹⁰ Meta, which is the only Defendant currently named in State AG cases, anticipates that each State AG Plaintiff would be served with substantially the same forty (40) interrogatories.

1 before any dispute is presented for resolution. In all events, YouTube and Snap reserve the right
 2 to argue that discovery limitations be calibrated to be proportional to the claims and defenses as
 3 asserted against them specifically.

4 If the Court is inclined to set limits now, YouTube and Snap believe that the maximum
 5 limits proposed by Defendants are more appropriate than those proposed by Plaintiffs for the
 6 reasons set forth herein, and that the parties can meet and confer on whether a lower number
 7 would be appropriate for any particular Party.

8 **B. Requests for Admission**

9 **Plaintiffs' Position:**

10 RFAs are not limited by the Rules of Civil Procedure or in the routine practice of complex
 11 litigation. They generally impose little burden and can serve as important tools to narrow areas of
 12 disputes, establish uncontroverted facts, and guide thoughtful discovery. "Rule 36 serves two
 13 vital purposes, both of which are designed to reduce trial time. . . .[F]irst to facilitate proof with
 14 respect to issues that cannot be eliminated from the case, and secondly, to narrow the issues by
 15 eliminating those that can be." Advisory committee's notes to 1970 amendment of Fed. R. Civ. P.
 16 36; *see also Leonard v. Stemtech Int'l Inc.*, 834 F.3d 376, 403 n.26 (3d Cir. 2016) ("Rule 36
 17 provides a tool to streamline the proof of controverted facts.").

18 Defendants' request that RFAs be limited departs from established norms in complex
 19 litigation and is impractical. Plaintiffs intend to be thoughtful and targeted in their RFAs in the
 20 context of this complex case, but if the Court decides upon Defendants' petition that RFAs
 21 propounded by Plaintiffs have become too voluminous or burdensome, it may reduce Defendants'
 22 burden to respond to RFAs by identifying which ones are appropriate and warrant response *see*,
 23 *e.g., Stokes v. Interline Brands Inc.*, 2013 WL 6056886 (N.D. Cal. Nov. 14, 2013), or by limiting
 24 Plaintiffs' additional RFAs at a later date in the discovery process, should the need arise.

25 **Defendants' Position:**

26 Defendants propose that Plaintiffs as a group (including the JCCP plaintiffs) be limited to
 27 no more than twenty-five (25) requests for admission on each Defendant (not including requests
 28 for admission related to the authentication of documents for trial, which could be served at a later

time), with the ability to serve additional requests for admission for good cause shown. Any Defendants named in State AG cases would be limited to serving the same number of requests for admission (no more than twenty-five (25)) on each State AG Plaintiff.¹¹

Defendants agree that Bellwether Orders, to the extent entered, shall govern the limitations as to the number and scope of requests for admission Defendants may collectively serve on the PI/SD Plaintiffs related to a discovery pool and ultimately the bellwether cases.

C. Number of Depositions¹²

1. Depositions of Defendants¹³

Plaintiffs' Position:

The PI/SD Plaintiffs may take up to forty (40) depositions of each Defendant, and may take up to 10 (ten) additional depositions of Defendants collectively, inclusive of current/former employees represented and produced for deposition by a Defendant and Rule 30(b)(6) depositions. The States Attorneys General may take up to twenty (20) depositions of each Defendant named by the State Attorneys General, inclusive of current/former employees represented and produced for deposition by that Defendant and Rule 30(b)(6) depositions. In the event a witness was employed by multiple Defendants and is represented and produced for deposition by multiple Defendants, then the deposition shall only count as a deposition regarding the Defendant that employed the witness last-in-time. For the avoidance of doubt, a Rule 30(b)(6) deposition notice counts as a single deposition even if multiple corporate representatives testify in response to the Rule 30(b)(6) deposition notice.

Defendants propose no more than a total of 140 hours of depositions collectively for all groups of Plaintiffs, with an additional limit of 21 hours of 30(b)(6) depositions per Defendant. Defendants would further limit Plaintiffs collectively to 30 deponents per Defendant, and would limit each deponent to 10 hours split amongst all Plaintiffs.

¹¹ Meta, which is the only Defendant currently named in State AG cases, anticipates that each State AG Plaintiff would be served with substantially the same twenty-five (25) requests for admission.

¹² The deposition limits set forth herein do not apply to expert witnesses.

¹³ The number of depositions excludes records custodians that may be necessary for authentication of business records.

Defendants' proposed limitations on depositions would be draconian in any MDL, and are particularly so here given the complexity and technical aspects of this case and the multiple categories of Plaintiffs pursuing different claims. For example, if each deposition can last only 10 hours, all Plaintiffs collectively would be entitled to only 14 depositions per Defendant. Defendants' proposed rules are also complicated enough that tracking how they operate will be akin to a logic game.

Plaintiffs oppose layering a limitation on the overall hours of depositions on top a limit on the number of depositions. However, in addition to proposing the numerical limits above, Plaintiffs propose a limitation of 14 hours on the record per defense witness, not to exceed 7 hours in a single day. Plaintiffs will coordinate amongst themselves to keep their questioning within these limits and avoid repetition. Plaintiffs will propose a draft deposition protocol by the deadline noted above, with provisions regarding these limits and other details. Plaintiffs' proposal allows different Plaintiffs pursuing different claims on behalf of different types of clients in different jurisdictions to have enough time to ask questions necessary to litigate their claims, while limiting those depositions to a finite number of witnesses and hours, and ensuring that redundant questioning is avoided.

Defendants' Position:

Defendants propose that Plaintiffs as a group (including the JCCP plaintiffs) may take up to a cumulative total of one hundred and forty (140) hours (approximately twenty (20) full deposition days) of depositions of each Defendant, inclusive of current/former employees and Rule 30(b)(6) depositions. This cumulative allowance for each Defendant is subject to the following additional provisions:

(a) each fact deposition shall be limited to no more than ten (10) hours total, with Defendants reserving the right to seek less time for specific witnesses on a showing of good cause;

(b) Plaintiffs shall be limited to no more than thirty (30) deponents per Defendant (with the witness(es) on any individual 30(b)(6) notice counting as one (1) witness);

(c) Plaintiffs may take up to a cumulative total of twenty-one (21) hours (approximately

three (3) full deposition days) of 30(b)(6) depositions of each Defendant;

(d) the 140-hour allowance does not include time spent on direct or re-cross;

(e) one (1) minute of re-cross shall be permitted for every one (1) minute of direct examination conducted of that witness.

The State Attorney General Plaintiffs may only participate in the depositions of Defendants specifically named by the State Attorney General Plaintiffs.

Snap and YouTube Defendants' Position:

YouTube and Snap agree that setting reasonable limits on depositions—in particular, the number of depositions and the hours allotted for taking those depositions—is appropriate in this proceeding, and agree that Plaintiffs should coordinate discovery among themselves to streamline and avoid duplication. But the parties have not yet had sufficient opportunity to fully assess and confer as to what specific limits are reasonable and appropriate in this case, including the applicability of Rule 26's proportionality principle. Moreover, YouTube and Snap's view is that this Plan should be focused on the overall structure and schedule for various discovery components in this matter. For these reasons, YouTube and Snap respectfully request that the parties be directed to further meet and confer as to particular limitations on depositions in connection with the forthcoming deposition protocol before any dispute is presented for resolution. In all events, YouTube and Snap reserve the right to argue that discovery limitations be calibrated to be proportional to the claims and defenses as asserted against them specifically. If the Court is inclined to set limits now, YouTube and Snap believe that the maximum limits proposed by Defendants are more appropriate than those proposed by Plaintiffs for the reasons set forth herein, and that the parties can meet and confer on whether a lower number would be appropriate for any particular Party.

2. Depositions of Plaintiffs

Plaintiffs' Position:

The Bellwether Order shall govern the limitations as to the number and scope of depositions Defendants may collectively take related to the bellwether cases. Defendants may not

1 take depositions of the States Attorneys General.

2 **Defendants' Position:**

3 Defendants agree that Bellwether Orders, to the extent entered, shall govern the
4 limitations as to the number and scope of depositions Defendants may collectively take of the
5 PI/SD Plaintiffs related to a discovery pool and ultimately the bellwether cases.

6 Defendants named by the State Attorneys General may collectively take no more than a
7 cumulative total of one hundred and forty (140) hours (approximately twenty (20) full deposition
8 days) of each State Attorney General Plaintiff.¹⁴ This cumulative allowance is subject to the
9 following additional provisions for each State Attorney General Plaintiff:

10 (a) each fact deposition shall be limited to no more than seven (7) hours total;¹⁵

11 (b) Defendants shall be limited to no more than thirty (30) deponents per State Attorney
12 General Plaintiff (with the witness(es) on any individual 30(b)(6) notice counting as one (1)
13 witness);

14 (c) Defendants may take up to a cumulative total of twenty-one (21) hours (approximately
15 three (3) full deposition days) of 30(b)(6) depositions of each State Attorney General Plaintiff;

16 (d) the 140-hour allowance does not include time spent on direct or re-cross;

17 (e) one (1) minute of re-cross shall be permitted for every one (1) minute of direct
18 examination conducted of that witness.

19 **3. Rule 30(b)(6) Depositions**

20 **Plaintiffs' Position:**

21 The Parties may notice and take multiple Rule 30(b)(6) depositions. The Party noticing a
22 Rule 30(b)(6) deposition (the "Noticing Party") may limit a Rule 30(b)(6) deposition notice to a
23

24 _____
25 ¹⁴ The State Attorney General Plaintiffs informed Defendants less than an hour before midnight
26 the day this filing was due that they were retracting their prior proposal that Defendants be
27 afforded twenty depositions of the State Attorneys General, and instead taking the position that
28 Defendants could take no depositions of the State Attorneys General at all. Given the timing,
Defendants did not have an opportunity to confer on or prepare a response to this remarkable
proposal before this filing was due, and so will address it at the DMC.

¹⁵ Assumes that the Meta Defendants remain the only Defendant group named by the State
Attorney General Plaintiffs; otherwise, the ten (10)-hour limit set forth above for depositions
taken by multiple Parties would apply.

discrete subject matter category and notice topics concerning that category (without prejudice to serving additional Rule 30(b)(6) notices as the discovery period continues.).

Defendants' Position:

The Parties may notice and take multiple Rule 30(b)(6) depositions, subject to the limitations set forth above.

As set forth above, Defendants propose that Plaintiffs as a group (including the JCCP plaintiffs) may take up to a cumulative total of twenty-one (21) hours (approximately three (3) full deposition days) of 30(b)(6) depositions of each Defendant, regardless of how many notices their topics may be split across, or the number of witnesses designated for each topic.

Defendants propose that any Defendants named by the State Attorney General Plaintiffs may take up to a cumulative total of twenty-one (21) hours (approximately three (3) full deposition days) of 30(b)(6) depositions of each State Attorney General Plaintiff, regardless of how many notices their topics may be split across, or the number of witnesses designated for each topic.

DATED: January 19, 2024

Respectfully submitted,

/s/ Lexi J. Hazam

LEXI J. HAZAM

**LIEFF CABRASER HEIMANN &
BERNSTEIN, LLP**

275 BATTERY STREET, 29TH FLOOR

SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94111-3339

Telephone: 415-956-1000

lhazam@lchb.com

CHRISTOPHER A. SEEGER

CHRISTOPHER L. AYERS

SEEGER WEISS, LLP

55 CHALLENGER ROAD, 6TH FLOOR

RIDGEFIELD PARK, NJ 07660

Telephone: 973-639-9100

Facsimile: 973-679-8656

cseeger@seegerweiss.com

cayers@seegerweiss.com

PREVIN WARREN

MOTLEY RICE LLC

401 9th Street NW Suite 630

Washington DC 20004
T: 202-386-9610
pwarren@motleyrice.com

Co-Lead Counsel

JENNIE LEE ANDERSON
ANDRUS ANDERSON, LLP
155 MONTGOMERY STREET, SUITE 900
SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94104
Telephone: 415-986-1400
jennie@andrusanderson.com

Liaison Counsel

JOSEPH G. VANZANDT
**BEASLEY ALLEN CROW METHVIN
PORTIS & MILES, P.C.**
234 COMMERCE STREET
MONTGOMERY, AL 36103
Telephone: 334-269-2343
joseph.vanzandt@beasleyallen.com

EMILY C. JEFFCOTT
MORGAN & MORGAN
220 W. GARDEN STREET, 9TH FLOOR
PENSACOLA, FL 32502
Telephone: 850-316-9100
ejeffcott@forthepeople.com

RON AUSTIN
RON AUSTIN LAW
400 Manhattan Blvd.
Harvey LA, 70058
Telephone: (504) 227-8100
raustin@ronaustinlaw.com

MATTHEW BERGMAN
GLENN DRAPER
SOCIAL MEDIA VICTIMS LAW CENTER
821 SECOND AVENUE, SUITE 2100
SEATTLE, WA 98104
Telephone: 206-741-4862
matt@socialmediavictims.org
glenn@socialmediavictims.org

JAMES J. BILSBORROW
WEITZ & LUXENBERG, PC
700 BROADWAY
NEW YORK, NY 10003
Telephone: 212-558-5500
Facsimile: 212-344-5461
jbilsborrow@weitzlux.com

PAIGE BOLDT

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28

WATTS GUERRA LLP
4 Dominion Drive, Bldg. 3, Suite 100
San Antonio, TX 78257
T: 210-448-0500
PBoldt@WattsGuerra.com

THOMAS P. CARTMELL
WAGSTAFF & CARTMELL LLP
4740 Grand Avenue, Suite 300
Kansas City, MO 64112
T: 816-701 1100
tcartmell@wcllp.com

JAYNE CONROY
SIMMONS HANLY CONROY, LLC
112 MADISON AVE, 7TH FLOOR
NEW YORK, NY 10016
Telephone: 917-882-5522
jconroy@simmonsfirm.com

CARRIE GOLDBERG
C.A. GOLDBERG, PLLC
16 Court St.
Brooklyn, NY 11241
T: (646) 666-8908
carrie@cagoldberglaw.com

KIRK GOZA
GOZA & HONNOLD, LLC
9500 Nall Avenue, Suite 400
Overland Park, KS 66207
T: 913-451-3433
kgoza@gohonlaw.com

SIN-TINY MARY LIU
**AYLSTOCK WITKIN KREIS &
OVERHOLTZ, PLLC**
17 EAST MAIN STREET, SUITE 200
PENSACOLA, FL 32502
Telephone: 510-698-9566
mliu@awkolaw.com

ANDRE MURA
GIBBS LAW GROUP, LLP
1111 BROADWAY, SUITE 2100
OAKLAND, CA 94607
Telephone: 510-350-9717
amm@classlawgroup.com

EMMIE PAULOS
LEVIN PAPANTONIO RAFFERTY
316 SOUTH BAYLEN STREET, SUITE 600
PENSACOLA, FL 32502
Telephone: 850-435-7107

1 epaulos@levinlaw.com

2 ROLAND TELLIS
3 DAVID FERNANDES
4 **BARON & BUDD, P.C.**
5 15910 Ventura Boulevard, Suite 1600
6 Encino, CA 91436
7 Telephone: (818) 839-2333
8 Facsimile: (818) 986-9698
9 rtellis@baronbudd.com
10 dfernandes@baronbudd.com

11 ALEXANDRA WALSH
12 **WALSH LAW**
13 1050 Connecticut Ave, NW, Suite 500
14 Washington D.C. 20036
15 T: 202-780-3014
16 awalsh@alexwalshlaw.com

17 MICHAEL M. WEINKOWITZ
18 **LEVIN SEDRAN & BERMAN, LLP**
19 510 WALNUT STREET
20 SUITE 500
21 PHILADELPHIA, PA 19106
22 Telephone: 215-592-1500
23 mweinkowitz@lfsbalw.com

24 DIANDRA "FU" DEBROSSE ZIMMERMANN
25 **DICELLO LEVITT**
26 505 20th St North
27 Suite 1500
28 Birmingham, Alabama 35203
Telephone: 205.855.5700
fu@dicellolevitt.com

ROBERT H. KLONOFF
ROBERT KLONOFF, LLC
2425 SW 76TH AVENUE
PORTLAND, OR 97225
Telephone: 503-702-0218
klonoff@usa.net

HILLARY NAPPI
HACH & ROSE LLP
112 Madison Avenue, 10th Floor
New York, New York 10016
Tel: 212.213.8311
hnappi@hrsclaw.com

ANTHONY K. BRUSTER
BRUSTER PLLC
680 N. Carroll Ave., Suite 110
Southlake, TX 76092

(817) 601-9564
akbruster@brusterpllc.com

FRANCOIS M. BLAUDEAU, MD JD FACHE
FCLM
**SOUTHERN INSTITUTE FOR MEDICAL
AND LEGAL AFFAIRS**
2762 B M Montgomery Street, Suite 101
Homewood, Alabama 35209
T: 205.564.2741
francois@southernmedlaw.com

JAMES MARSH
MARSH LAW FIRM PLLC
31 HUDSON YARDS, 11TH FLOOR
NEW YORK, NY 10001-2170
Telephone: 212-372-3030
jamesmarsh@marshlaw.com

Attorneys for Plaintiffs

PHILIP J. WEISER

Attorney General
State of Colorado

/s/ Bianca E. Miyata

Bianca E. Miyata, CO Reg. No. 42012,
pro hac vice
Senior Assistant Attorney General
Lauren M. Dickey, CO Reg. No. 45773
First Assistant Attorney General
Megan Paris Rundlet, CO Reg. No. 27474
Senior Assistant Solicitor General
Elizabeth Orem, CO Reg. No. 58309
Assistant Attorney General
Colorado Department of Law
Ralph L. Carr Judicial Center
Consumer Protection Section
1300 Broadway, 7th Floor
Denver, CO 80203
Phone: (720) 508-6651
bianca.miyata@coag.gov

*Attorneys for Plaintiff State of Colorado, ex rel.
Philip J. Weiser, Attorney General*

ROB BONTA

Attorney General
State of California

/s/ Megan O'Neill

Nick A. Akers (CA SBN 211222)
Senior Assistant Attorney General
Bernard Eskandari (SBN 244395)
Supervising Deputy Attorney
General
Megan O'Neill (CA SBN 343535)
Joshua Olszewski-Jubelirer
(CA SBN 336428)
Marissa Roy (CA SBN 318773)
Deputy Attorneys General
California Department of Justice
Office of the Attorney General
455 Golden Gate Ave., Suite 11000
San Francisco, CA 94102-7004
Phone: (415) 510-4400
Fax: (415) 703-5480
Bernard.Eskandari@doj.ca.gov

*Attorneys for Plaintiff the People of the State of
California*

DANIEL J. CAMERON

Attorney General Commonwealth
of Kentucky

/s/ J. Christian Lewis

J. Christian Lewis (KY Bar No. 87109),

Pro hac vice

Philip Heleringer (KY Bar No.

96748),

Pro hac vice

Gregory B. Ladd (KY Bar No.

95886),

Pro hac vice

Zachary Richards (KY Bar No.

99209),

Pro hac vice

Assistant Attorneys General

1024 Capital Center Drive, Suite

200

Frankfort, KY 40601

CHRISTIAN.LEWIS@KY.GOV

PHILIP.HELERINGER@KY.GOV

GREG.LADD@KY.GOV

ZACH.RICHARDS@KY.GOV

Phone: (502) 696-5300

Fax: (502) 564-2698

Attorneys for Plaintiff the

Commonwealth of Kentucky

COVINGTON & BURLING LLP

By: /s/ Philips A. Jones

Phyllis A. Jones, *pro hac vice*

Paul W. Schmidt, *pro hac vice*

COVINGTON & BURLING LLP

One City Center

850 Tenth Street, NW

Washington, DC 20001-4956

Telephone: + 1 (202) 662-6000

Facsimile: + 1 (202) 662-6291

Email: pajones@cov.com

Attorney for Defendants Meta Platforms, Inc. f/k/a

Facebook, Inc.; Facebook Holdings, LLC;

Facebook Operations, LLC; Facebook Payments,

Inc.; Facebook Technologies, LLC; Instagram,

LLC; Siculus, Inc.; and Mark Elliot Zuckerberg

FAEGRE DRINKER LLP

By: /s/ Andrea Roberts Pierson
Andrea Roberts Pierson, *pro hac vice*
Amy Fiterman, *pro hac vice*
FAEGRE DRINKER LLP
300 N. Meridian Street, Suite 2500
Indianapolis, IN 46204
Telephone: + 1 (317) 237-0300
Facsimile: + 1 (317) 237-1000
Email: andrea.pierson@faegredrinker.com
Email: amy.fiterman@faegredrinker.com

GEOFFREY DRAKE, *pro hac vice*
David Mattern, *pro hac vice*
KING & SPALDING LLP
1180 Peachtree Street, NE, Suite 1600
Atlanta, GA 30309
Tel.: 404-572-4600
Email: gdrake@kslaw.com
Email: dmattern@kslaw.com

*Attorneys for Defendants TikTok Inc. and
ByteDance Inc.*

MUNGER, TOLLES & OLSEN LLP

By: /s/ Jonathan H. Blavin
Jonathan H. Blavin, SBN 230269
MUNGER, TOLLES & OLSON LLP
560 Mission Street, 27th Floor
San Francisco, CA 94105-3089
Telephone: (415) 512-4000
Facsimile: (415) 512-4077
Email: jonathan.blavin@mto.com

Rose L. Ehler (SBN 29652)
Victoria A. Degtyareva (SBN 284199)
Laura M. Lopez, (SBN 313450)
Ariel T. Teshuva (SBN 324238)
MUNGER, TOLLES & OLSON LLP
350 South Grand Avenue, 50th Floor
Los Angeles, CA 90071-3426
Telephone: (213) 683-9100
Facsimile: (213) 687-3702
Email: rose.ehler@mto.com
Email: victoria.degtyareva@mto.com
Email: Ariel.Teshuva@mto.com

Lauren A. Bell (*pro hac vice forthcoming*)
MUNGER, TOLLES & OLSON LLP
601 Massachusetts Ave., NW St.,

Suite 500 E
Washington, D.C. 20001-5369
Telephone: (202) 220-1100
Facsimile: (202) 220-2300
Email: lauren.bell@mto.com

Attorneys for Defendant Snap Inc.

WILSON SONSINI GOODRICH & ROSATI
Professional Corporation

By: /s/ Brian M. Willen
Brian M. Willen
WILSON SONSINI GOODRICH & ROSATI
1301 Avenue of the Americas, 40th Floor
New York, New York 10019
Telephone: (212) 999-5800
Facsimile: (212) 999-5899
Email: bwillen@wsgr.com

Lauren Gallo White
Samantha A. Machock
WILSON SONSINI GOODRICH & ROSATI
One Market Plaza, Spear Tower, Suite 3300
San Francisco, CA 94105
Telephone: (415) 947-2000
Facsimile: (415) 947-2099
Email: lwhite@wsgr.com
Email: smachock@wsgr.com

Christopher Chiou
WILSON SONSINI GOODRICH & ROSATI
633 West Fifth Street
Los Angeles, CA 90071-2048
Telephone: (323) 210-2900
Facsimile: (866) 974-7329
Email: cchiou@wsgr.com

*Attorneys for Defendants YouTube, LLC,
Google LLC, and Alphabet Inc.*

WILLIAMS & CONNOLLY LLP

By: /s/ Joseph G. Petrosinelli

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28

Joseph G. Petrosinelli
jpetrosinelli@wc.com
Ashley W. Hardin
ahardin@wc.com
680 Maine Avenue, SW
Washington, DC 20024
Telephone.: 202-434-5000
Fax: 202-434-5029

*Attorneys for Defendants YouTube, LLC,
Google LLC, and Alphabet Inc.*

PURSUANT TO STIPULATION, IT IS SO ORDERED.

Dated: _____, 2024

PETER H. KANG
United States Magistrate Judge

ATTESTATION

I, Lexi J. Hazam, hereby attest, pursuant to N.D. Cal. Civil L.R. 5-1, that the concurrence to the filing of this document has been obtained from each signatory hereto.

DATED: January 19, 2024

/s/ Lexi J. Hazam

LEXI J. HAZAM

**LIEFF CABRASER HEIMANN &
BERNSTEIN, LLP**

275 BATTERY STREET, 29TH FLOOR
SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94111-3339

Telephone: 415-956-1000

lhazam@lchb.com